

DEC 05 2005

CHARLES L. THOEMING
ATTORNEY & COUNSELOR AT LAW
REGISTERED PATENT ATTORNEY

BIELEN, LAMPE & THOEMING, P.A.
TWO CORPORATE CENTRE
1390 WILLOW PASS ROAD
SUITE 1020
CONCORD, CA 94520

(925) 288.9720 ✱
(925) 288.9731 FAX
hadvbaxen@earthlink.net EMAIL

ADMITTED TO PRACTICE
IN CALIFORNIA AND TEXAS

FACSIMILE COMMUNICATION COVERSHEET

DATE: December 5, 2005

CLIENT NO.: 11103

FACSIMILE NO.: (571)273.8300

TO: MAIL STPO AF
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

FROM: Charles L. Thoeming

NO. OF PAGES: (including this coversheet) Thirteen (13)

COMMENTS:

Filed under cover of this coversheet for Application Serial No. 10/691,414 are: 1) Facsimile Coversheet; 2) Transmittal; 3) PTO-2038; 4) Notice of Appeal [O + 1 copy](4 pages total); 5) PTO/SB/33; and Argument for Pre-Appeal Brief Request (5 pages) for a total of thirteen (13) pages.

Respectfully submitted
/Charles L. Thoeming/
Charles L. Thoeming
Registration No. 43,951

The information contained in this facsimile is confidential and may be subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product protection. This facsimile communication is intended only for use by the individual named above. Any erroneous transmission of this facsimile communication to any unintended individual or entity is not intended to waive any applicable privilege or protection, the same hereby wholly reserved. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, or the employee or agent responsible to deliver it to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original to us by the United States Postal Service.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

DEC 05 2005

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TRANSMITTAL FORM (to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)	Application Number	10/691,414	
	Filing Date	10/22/2003	
	First Named Inventor	ANDREW NUSS	
	Art Unit	2192	
	Examiner Name	ANDRE R. FOWLKES	
Total Number of Pages in This Submission	13	Attorney Docket Number	11103

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): 1) PTO-2038; 2) PTO/SB/33; 3) ARGUMENT FOR PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REVIEW; 4) FAX COVERSHEET; and 5) Copy of NOTICE OF APPEAL
Remarks		
SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT		
Firm Name	CHARLES L. THOEMING/Bielen, Lampe & Thoeming, P.A.	
Signature	/CHARLES L. THOEMING/	
Printed name	CHARLES L. THOEMING	
Date	5 DECEMBER 2005	Reg. No. 43,951

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:		
Signature	/CHARLES L. THOEMING/	
Typed or printed name	CHARLES L. THOEMING	Date 5 DECEMBER 2005

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

Doc Code: AP.PRE.REQ

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PTO/SB/33 (07-05)

Approved for use through xx/xx/200x. OMB 0651-00xx
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW		Docket Number (Optional) 11103	
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to "Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450" [37 CFR 1.8(a)] on <u>Faxed on 12/05/2005</u> Signature <u>/Charles L. Thoeming/</u> Typed or printed name <u>Charles L. Thoeming</u>		Application Number 10/691,414	Filed 10/22/2003
		First Named Inventor ANDREW NUSS	
		Art Unit 2192	Examiner Andre R. Fowlkes
Applicant requests review of the final rejection in the above-identified application. No amendments are being filed with this request.			
This request is being filed with a notice of appeal.			
The review is requested for the reason(s) stated on the attached sheet(s). Note: No more than five (5) pages may be provided.			
I am the			
<input type="checkbox"/> applicant/inventor.		<u>/Charles L. Thoeming/</u> Signature	
<input type="checkbox"/> assignee of record of the entire interest. See 37 CFR 3.71. Statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) is enclosed. (Form PTO/SB/96)		<u>Charles L. Thoeming</u> Typed or printed name	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent of record. 43,951 Registration number		<u>925.288.9720</u> Telephone number	
<input type="checkbox"/> attorney or agent acting under 37 CFR 1.34. Registration number if acting under 37 CFR 1.34		<u>12/05/2005</u> Date	
NOTE: Signatures of all the inventors or assignees of record of the entire interest or their representative(s) are required. Submit multiple forms if more than one signature is required, see below*.			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> *Total of <u>One (1)</u> forms are submitted.			

This collection of information is required by 35 U.S.C. 132. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11, 1.14 and 41.6. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER****DEC 05 2005**

**APPLICANT'S REASONS FOR WHICH
PRE-APPEAL BRIEF REQUEST FOR REVIEW
IS BEING SUBMITTED WITH NOTICE OF APPEAL**

In re application of: **Alderson, David H.**Application No.: **10/691,414**Filed: **10/22/2003**First Named Inventor: **Nuss, Andrew**For: **Grammar for Regular Expressions**Group No.: **2192**Examiner: **Andre R. Fowlkes**

**Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

Sir:

The Examiner's final rejection of claims 58 - 83 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is founded on one reference -- Friedl, "Mastering Regular Expressions," 2ND Ed., ISBN: 0-596-00289-0, and three reference points therein per the Examiner: pages 4:14-17; 33:1-4; and 38:2-4. These references actually correspond respectively to page 1 of the Friedl book, to the opening paragraph of Chapter 8 from Friedl on Java regexes, and to the opening paragraph of Chapter 9 from Friedl on .NET regexes. The three references are only general statements to the following effect: (1) regex engines transform ("spindle" and "mutilate") data, (2) Java has incorporated support for regexes, (3) .NET has incorporated support for regexes. In no way do these citations describe any particular grammatical power of a particular engine, and therefore impinge on the Applicant's claims only in that the Applicant's invention falls into the broad category of regex-grammar and engine, as do .NET and Java (among others). Most telling is that the Examiner primarily relies upon the first citation, appearing on page 1 of the book, which states the general purpose of a regex engine. For each rejected claim, the Examiner sprinkles in one or more of these opaque reference points from Friedl as a basis for a §102(b) rejection arguing that "the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States."

Based on the citations offered by the Examiner as a basis for rejection, it is apparent that the Examiner believes the invention to be equivalent in purpose to existing regex engines in the art, such as those offered by .NET and Java. However, the inventor's claims, both individually

and collectively, do not claim the purpose of a regex engine, but instead claim specific grammatical powers not offered by any other regex engine. To establish equivalence, the Examiner must do much more than state that the purpose of the invention is equivalent to the purpose of prior art engines, but must show that the specific claimed powers are elsewhere offered. That they are not elsewhere offered is in fact demonstrated in the rebuttal to the first office action by an in-depth study of the Friedl text, supplied in the analysis of individual claims, showing claim by claim that the grammatical power and/or method of implementation is non-equivalent to prior art.

The claims of the invention focus on specific areas of regexes -- side-effects, regex encapsulations, and the subjunctive grammar forms. The job of rejecting individual claims entails showing how the claimed grammatical powers of regex forms in the invention already exist and is not accomplished by stating that "regular expressions can add, remove, isolate, and generally fold, spindle, and mutilate all kinds of text and data." The power of a grammatical form of a regex goes beyond its purpose, and includes the aspect of programmer enablement. A grammatical form of a regex is non-equivalent, and therefore novel, and unanticipated, if its matching characteristics and/or side-effect characteristics cannot be emulated by grammars of other regex engines. In no single claim is it claimed by the inventor that the invention is the first to "add, remove, isolate, and generally fold, spindle, and mutilate all kinds of text and data." Instead, specific grammar forms are claimed by the inventor as having specific powers. Certainly, when properly employed by the programmer, these grammar forms and the invention in general allow the "folding, spindling, and mutilating" of data, but the general purpose of a regex engine is in no way claimed by the inventor. Again, the Examiner has merely cited the general purpose of a regex engine against the inventor's claims. The inventor, however, is not attempting to "reinvent" the concept of regexes, but is in fact extending the prior art of regexes by offering new grammatical powers, additionally evidenced by new methods of implementation.

In terms of the possibility that the collective of claims is equivalent in power to any regex grammar and engine described in Friedl, such would be an approach naturally taken by a skeptic, but the proof would not consist of quoting a reference which states the general purpose of a regex engine. That the claims extend the art is consistent with the thesis that the grammatical powers of the invention are not found in the art, and this position is well supported in the rebuttal made by the inventor to the first office action, and this position is shown in the remainder of this correspondence not to be supported by the Examiner citations. The Examiner seemingly believes the disclosed and claimed grammar forms are equivalent to the cited Friedl

reference; however, there is no detail in Friedl for the grammar of the present invention as disclosed and claimed. To show that an invention has not extended the art of regular expressions, one must do more than provide one citation that loosely defines a regex engine, plus two more citations that state that two particular regex engines exist (.NET and Java). Mere glittering generality assertion of similar intended purpose between a reference and an Applicant's claims does not meet any level of equivalence to satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

Concerning the overall impact of the inventor's claims, Applicant submits that the primary Friedl reference merely describes the purpose of a regex engine, and that the supplemental references indicate that Java and .NET provide regex engine support. Hypothetically, if an invention disclosed and claimed regexes that rehashed Perl's grammar (representative of the current state of the art), without providing any new grammatical powers (features), such non-novelty could not be demonstrated by a reference that merely establishes the purpose of a regex engine. The Examiner would necessarily need to demonstrate on a claim-by-claim basis that the grammatical power offered by the hypothetical engine is also offered by Perl or the equivalent, without substantial differences. Instead, in the final rejection of claims 58 - 83, the Examiner quotes the Friedl reference that defines only the goals of a regex engine as reason for rejecting the particular grammatical advantage as disclosed and claimed.

Claims 58 - 83 do not rehash Perl, as do the other significant regex engines in the art (demonstrated by the Friedl reference). On the contrary, the invention extends the grammatical concept of side-effects, which is shown in the specification and supported in Applicant's rebuttal to the Examiner's reasoning in the first office action by an in depth study and comparison of the Friedl reference (using citations well into the Friedl reference). The invention of claims 58 - 83 applies the concept of side-effects to the subjunctive grammar form, which is not offered by any other regex engine. Further, the invention extends the grammatical powers of capture and (Perl) code-assertions in a variety of claimed ways. The invention of claims 58 - 83 extends the idea of regex encapsulation (offered only by Perl) to allow parameterization of such encapsulations **(parameterization not offered by Perl)**.

The invention of claims 58 - 83, as related to the grammars of side-effects, the subjunctive, and parameterizable rules, is not elsewhere offered in the art. To demonstrate the contrary, one would have to show by specific citation that such grammar forms do elsewhere exist, and with equivalent power, or that such grammar forms add no grammatical advantage to warrant invention. Otherwise, if easily created, they would already exist in Perl. Instead, the

Friedl reference comments on an aspect of the art which he states would be advantageous if offered by Perl, namely the scoping of variables to code-assertions (similar to the DoPattern of the invention), first accomplished by the invention. Moreover, to establish that the grammar forms of invention of claims 58 - 83 do not appreciably enable a regex programmer to accomplish new expressions, the Friedl citation(s) fails as a 35 U.S.C. 102(b) reference, since it serves only to define the landscape. For example, the invention shows the usefulness of allowing encapsulations of regexes to be parameterizable. The invention of claims 69 - 75 shows how it is accomplished. The Friedl text does not disclose or otherwise teach such a feature as being possible. The Examiner does not address this specific feature. If properly considered, the Examiner would have to cite the Friedl reference that discusses "regex objects." It would then be apparent that the novelty afforded by the encapsulated regexes of claims 69 - 75 is their parameterizability. Just as functions in all programming languages derive their remarkable reusability from parameters, the encapsulated regexes of the invention derive remarkable reusability from parameters. Yet the Examiner does not cite the existence of parameterizable regex encapsulations outside of the invention, nor does such exist.

The Examiner's logic in using a page 1 reference from Friedl to finally reject claims 58 - 83, if extended to other software, would seemingly bar advancements in the art of designing optimizing compilers by a citation from page 1 of a text on compiler design which merely makes a sweeping summary of the goal of optimizing compilers. Yet such inventions abound, claims thereto are allowed by the US patent office, and said claims issue as U.S. patents.

Applicant has further concern regarding the degree of examination presented by the final rejection of Claims 58 - 83. For example, in each claim rejection the Examiner references operator overloading (even underlined three times!), when all references to adapting C operators were withdrawn in the amended claim set. Although the idea of adapting C expression operators to regex composition is novel to the invention, these claims were withdrawn as the Examiner interpreted operator adapting as true overloading as found in C++ and C#. The Examiner's concluding remarks state that the "added limitations on which the Applicant relies" are fully addressed. Applicant's rebuttal performed adequate analysis for the Examiner to grasp the distinctions relative to Perl and related NFA engines. This rebuttal was seemingly ignored, as evidenced by 1) the Examiner's failure to notice that what he interpreted as operator overloading claims were withdrawn from the amended claim set, 2) individual final rejections all based on a general remark by Friedl as to the purpose of a regex engine, and 3) no individual final rejection that addresses the intrinsic grammatical power(s) as disclosed and claimed.

In summary, (1) the citations given by the Examiner from Friedl are too general to be used as the basis for rejection of any claim whatsoever, much less for 35 U.S.C. §102(b), (2) the Examiner did not notice the withdrawal of claims related to operator adapting, evidencing a lack of study of the rebuttal and amended claims, (3) the remarkable power of parameterizable encapsulations of regexes is not offered anywhere outside of the invention, evidencing either the Examiner's failure to understand the invention, or the Examiner's inadequate understanding of the art. Moreover, if the Examiner were a Perl and/or Friedl reference expert, then rejected claims 58 – 83 would be anticipated only by detailed references deep in the Friedl text (there are none). The lack of such references conclusively indicates that examination should be reopened.

Dated: December 5, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,
/Charles L. Thoeming/
Charles L. Thoeming
Registration No. 43,951

BIELEN, LAMPE & THOEMING, P.A.
1390 Willow Pass Road
Suite 1020
Concord, CA 94520
(925)288.9720
(925)288.9731 Facsimile

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence and all related papers as itemized hereunder are being sent by facsimile transmission to 571.273.8300 under a facsimile coversheet addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on December 5, 2005.

Related Papers: PTO-2038 [1 page]
PTO/SB/21 [1 page]
PTO/SB/33 [1 page]
Original and One (1) Copy of Notice of Appeal [4 pages total]
Facsimile Coversheet [1 page]

/Charles L. Thoeming/
Charles L. Thoeming, Registered Representative of
Applicant
Registration No. 43,951